

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 19, 2009, and supplemental to the Amendment filed February 19, 2010, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the present application. Claim 20 is hereby canceled.

**I. Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claimed process must be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or transforms a particular article to a different state or thing.

As previously submitted, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, 15 and 19. Further, Applicant has now amended independent claims 1, 4, 15 and 19 to recite “computer processor,” as discussed during the interview with the Examiners. Therefore, Applicant believes that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection should be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill et al. (US 2002/009574 A1), and in further view of Panico (US 2003/062536 A1), and further in view of Chase (US 2005/0098627 A1).

As indicated above, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein the camping pad attribute information includes information regarding the geographic location and availability of at least one of water and sewer connections on the camping pad.”

Applicant submits that the art cited by the Examiner does not teach this aspect of the claim. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

To the extent independent claims 4, 15, and 19 recite similar subject matter, claims 4, 15 and 19 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

### **III. Rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill in view of Panico, further in view of Chase and further in view of Inokuchi (USP 2004/0080510). Claim 13 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 4 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Inokuchi does not cure the deficiencies of Cahill, Panico and Chase.

### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

Date: April 8, 2010